

Faculty Senate Minutes
Tuesday, December 5th, 2017

4:00 pm in the Charles Hunter Room of the Hunter Conference Center

In Attendance : Bruce Howard, Nathan Barker, David Berri, Doug Wayman, Scott Lanning, David Tufte, Janice Scarinci, Abigail Larson, Lee Montgomery, Tony Pellegrini, Joel Judd, Angela Pool-Funai, Dave Lunt, Jason Smith, Liz Olsen, Jennifer Sorensen, Danny Hatch, Jonathan Holiman, Lynn Vartan, Benjamin Sowards, Scott Knowles, Megan Brunsvold, Mackay Steffensen, Matthew Roberts, Mark Meilstrup, Chris Monson, Daniel Eves, Selwyn Layton, Randall Violet, Bill Heyborne, Not in attendance: Tim Lewis, Hala Sweringen, Shalini Kesar

Guests: Brad Cook, James Sage, Steve Barney, Johnny Maclean

Call to Order 4:10 (technical difficulties)

- Recognition of Presenters 4:11
 - a. Steve Barney, LRT Policy Revision Co-Chair
Johnny MacLean, LRT Policy Revision Co-Chair
 - b. Dave Lunt, Senator, Library Committee
 - c. Benjamin Sowards, Senator, University Press Editorial Board
 - d. Angela Pool-Funai, Senator, Academic Standards and Admissions
- Approval of minutes from November meeting. 4:12
- LRT Process (Steve Barney and Johnny MacLean) 4:13
 - a. Vote on the Value and Purpose statements
Discussion about the value and purpose statement.

Chris Monson – faculty members are reticent about the wording of the policy would like it to be worded differently

Scott Knowles – The faculty in his area were worried about the specific points of the policy. Also scholarship doesn't have its own separate sentence which may demean its importance.

Steve Barney – That is good, thank you for the feedback.

Johnny MacLean – We are still having this conversation and it will change in language as we get more specifics. The specific suggestions, like the sentence about scholarship is really helpful in crafting these statements.

Lynn Vartan – Who is involved about the conversation about scholarship versus creative aspects?

Johnny MacLean – All of the departments have an open invitation to discuss this so everyone is invited into this discussion. While we are interested in this discussion it is by no means

Passing the motion for the direction the vision and values statement provided by the LRT Task Force from the Senate with 5 abstentions.

- b. Definitions and Evaluative Criteria 2nd draft (4:28 PM)

The criticisms have been noted and there is a lot of conversation about the comments in shaping the criteria.

Johnny MacLean – We have received quite a few comments on the definitions. We are asking for specific questions as to changes that can be made. The committee is invested in the language so we can improve the message so there is no chance for a misunderstanding.

Nathan Barker – We have all of the documents to review and will now have discussion about it.

Bruce Howard – One of the aspects of the new policies is the mentorship teams. Will this happen at the same time as when FAAR are being finished and turn in?

Johnny – We are still working on the processes with this idea so we will accept all the feedback we can to make this more helpful. It is a move to make the LRT process more formative instead of punitive. We want to move to a goal oriented process it increases the engagement and buy-in of the faculty. The promotion and tenure mentorship will allow the faculty develop their goals to be in line with the university mission. This allows the faculty to have ownership of their progress. It may reduce to overall workload for the faculty. This is a move toward a more formative method instead of a judgement or punitive assessment.

Steve Barney – This also will move over to post-tenure which may be a chance for the faculty move the burden of proof off of them and on to the administration.

Abby – I am a little nervous of having all of my eggs in the P & T mentorship basket.

Janice – I really like the idea of a formative move with the mentorship so that it can be used to assess your goals. This allows for more or a chance to look back over your performance on a more frequent basis.

Johnny – We are still developing the process so after the mentorship group agrees on these goals, we can accommodate changes as we move through the year. This is about process but I think we are supposed to talk about the definitions.

Steve Barney – There is an open faculty forum in January for feedback. This will help the faculty improve their process.

Mark Meilstrup – The wording about as you improve you should move toward the integrated use, but is this at the expense of traditional scholarship.

Lynn Vartan – In the definitions, I would feel better if there was wording about “as defined by the departments. “It is hard to see how the department document fits into this without that recognition.”

Matt – How much longer are you accepting comments on the definitions?

Johnny – We are still accepting comments on everything but there is only one open survey about the definitions and evaluation criteria. This will remain open until February.

Megan Brunsvold – In trying to define faculty engagement, I felt that the redundancy of engagement and making a circular reference to define engagement with engagement. If we are going to define this at a department level, could it be in an appendix or off to the side. This way we could stick to meat of the policy and focus on the salient points. Engaged is used in some places but not in others.

Johnny – We can make those changes and I think it will make it clearer. We can remove engaged scholarship and just say scholarship. We are trying to use the words that are in the strategic plan. It seems like the strategic plan is pushing us toward engaged activities.

Lynn – Is the wording going to change in the strategic plan before the LRT policy?

Johnny – We will shoot for timeless language in our future efforts.

Steve – Because what the university says they value hasn't always been validated in the LRT policy.

Dave Berri – On the Teaching effectiveness, the second sentence links scholarship to what you are teaching. I don't feel that scholarship should be mentioned in the teaching effectiveness. It doesn't work there at all.

Johnny – I appreciate it and I think we can get rid of that sentence and still have our message.

- Committee Reports

- a. University Press Editorial Board (Benjamin Sowards Senate Representative) 4:56 PM
I volunteered for this committee thinking it would have to do with the editorial decisions, which is what I do. But we haven't met so I don't know what we are doing.

- b. Academic Standards and Admissions (Angela Pool-Funai, Senate Representative) 4:57 PM

- Is a part of policy 4.13 and they look at incoming students to make sure that they are capable of surviving in the university environment. The program for less prepared students, College connections, is being evaluated as to its efficacy.

- c. Library Committee (Dave Lunt Senate Representative) 5:00 PM

- Policy 13.13 is supposed to comment on the state of the library's collection. It is from 1990 but it was updated in 2007. This is used to give publicity to the university so that everyone aware of what is going on at the library.

- Pick committees for next meeting (Nathan Barker) 5:01
Staff Association

Policy Procedure Arbitration
Distance Ed

- Follow up on the “Report an Ethical Concern” link on the Faculty/Staff page (Nathan Barker) 5:03 PM

This was found on the faculty& staff page to voice ethical concerns. It was a concern statewide 5 years ago. SUU wrote its own program(this is not “ethics point”). SUU doesn’t get the identity of the person, so that now they can respond which was not possible before this. Frequency of use of this link is about one concern a month.

- Follow up on the Intellectual Property Policy (Nathan Barker) 5:05 PM

There are concerns brought up that there is some inconsistency in the policy, so please write your concerns to Dean Saunders. The Faculty Senate might want to hire a lawyer to make sure that faculty interests are being looked after.

Ben Sowards – This is matter of contract law not copyright. That is dictated by the courts, so we don’t need to draft new language.

Motion to request funds for legal counsel for intellectual property. Passed unanimously.

- Motion for Executive Session 5:10 PM
 - a. Food break while non-senators exit

Executive sessions are intended to protect the innocent and assure confidentiality about sensitive matters. The time spent in executive session is not for formal voting, rather time spent sorting things out privately. Board members don’t take any parliamentary action during executive session. Since the secretary only records actions and actions don’t occur in executive session, there should be nothing to report. Executive sessions should be used thoughtfully. They should never give the appearance that the board is doing something behind the backs of management or other stakeholders All discussions that take place during executive session should be held in the strictest of confidence. (<http://www.boardeffect.com>)

- b. Senate Treasurer’s Report (3 min)
 - c. Senate President Elect’s Report (5-10 min)
 - d. Senate President’s Report (5-10 min)

- New Business 5:51

Janice Scarinci – With the discussion of LRT can use a discussion with an IDEA person to help us figure out how it works. So we can use IDEA results for our FAARs.

Scott Lanning – We may want to look at a different product instead of IDEA.

Abigail Larson – A minimum of 4.5 out of 5 for all IDEA reviews to be used for promotion and tenure in my college.

Lynn – Can we have a conversation about the LRT document as a faculty senate? In an executive session?

- Motion to Adjourn 6:17 PM
 - a. Next Meeting, Thursday January 11th , 2017